

Chapter 15

Recreation

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 15

Recreation

This chapter analyzes the proposed action's potential effects on recreation. Related discussions are found in Chapter 3 (*Land Use and Planning*).

Key sources of data used in the preparation of this chapter include the following.

- The proposed Habitat Conservation Plan (Appendix B).
- GIS information for the action area (Appendix B).
- Websites for the National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS), U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) listed among references cited at the end of this section.

Affected Environment

Regulatory Framework

Federal, state, and local agencies maintain various types of public recreation facilities, including national parks and forests, state parks and recreation areas, community parks and recreation facilities, and numerous types of reserve lands. The following sections provide a brief description of the major federal and state agencies that oversee recreational facilities in the action area as well as a description of the approach to recreation planning by local agencies. As identified elsewhere in this document, PG&E's land use planning is under the sole jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). However, as described under *Environmental Commitments* in Chapter 2, PG&E strives to work with local jurisdictions and other agencies to ensure that their concerns are considered in project planning, construction, and operation.

Federal Agencies

National Park Service

The NPS administers the 385 areas contained in the National Park System. The mission of NPS is to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of present and future generations. NPS cooperates with various partnering agencies in the U.S. and throughout the world to achieve its mission (National Park Service 2004).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The USFWS manages the 93-million-acre National Wildlife Refuge System and the Fisheries program. The mission of USFWS is to work with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. To this end, USFWS enforces federal wildlife laws, protects endangered species, manages migratory birds, restores nationally significant fisheries, and conserves and restores wildlife habitat, including wetlands. USFWS also oversees federal aid programs providing hundreds of millions of dollars derived from excise taxes on fishing and hunting equipment to support state fish and wildlife agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2004).

USDA Forest Service

The USFS manages public lands in national forests and grasslands. As the largest forestry research organization in the world, USFS is charged with sustaining the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. This mission includes providing technical and financial assistance to state and private forestry agencies as needs are identified (U.S. Forest Service 2004).

Bureau of Land Management

The BLM, an agency of the U.S. Department of the Interior, is responsible for managing some 261 million acres of public land, primarily in the 11 contiguous western states and Alaska. The BLM also manages subsurface mineral resources on National Park lands and lands of the National Wildlife Refuge system (most of which are withdrawn from active mineral leasing and development), and oversees operations on 56 million acres of Native American tribal lands where mineral recovery is taking place.

BLM's public lands offer a wide variety of recreational opportunities, including hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, boating, hang-gliding, off-highway vehicle

use, mountain biking, and birdwatching. BLM lands also include important natural and cultural heritage sites (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management).

State Agencies

State Parks

DPR manages more than 270 park units that support a diverse assortment of natural, cultural, and recreational resources. DPR is responsible for almost one-third of California's scenic coastline and manages coastal wetlands, estuaries, beaches, and dune systems. DPR's mission is to provide for the health, inspiration and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2004).

California Department of Fish and Game

The DFG maintains native fish, wildlife, plants, and natural communities for their intrinsic and ecological value and their benefits to people. DFG's responsibilities encompass habitat protection and maintenance in a sufficient amount and quality to ensure the survival of all species and natural communities. DFG is also responsible for the diversified use of fish and wildlife, including recreational, commercial, scientific, and educational uses. DFG's mission is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources and the habitats on which they depend for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public (California Department of Fish and Game 2004).

Local Planning

Public recreation facilities are provided by cities, counties, and special districts. Lands owned and/or managed by private organizations may also provide recreational opportunities to the public, although these lands are not typically located within an institutionally recognized recreational facility. Local general plans lay out the pattern of future development within a community, including open-space and recreational land uses. For more information about general plans and local land use planning, see Chapter 3 (*Land Use and Planning*). The planning process for recreational facilities typically includes

- establishing per-capita standards for providing parks and recreational facilities (these standards vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction depending on identified local needs);

- assessing present and future demands for parks and recreational facilities;
- conducting an inventory of areas identified as suitable for parks and recreational purposes, including areas of outstanding scenic beauty;
- reviewing federal, state, and local plans for the acquisition and improvement of public parks; and
- developing and implementing programs for the protection, conservation, and acquisition of open space lands.

To facilitate implementation of planned growth patterns, general plans typically include goals and/or policies addressing the coordination of land use patterns with the development and maintenance of utilities and other infrastructure. Local planning documents and zoning ordinances typically provide for the installation, operation, and maintenance of utilities in most land use designation types, as necessary to facilitate and support planned growth patterns. Such accommodations are made either as a permitted use (automatically allowed under the zoning designation) or through issuance of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Existing Conditions

The action area encompasses part or all of nine San Joaquin Valley counties: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno, Kings, Kern, Mariposa, Madera, and Tulare (Figure 1-1). The recreational context for the proposed action includes all federal, state, and local recreational facilities within the action area.

Recreational opportunities vary from county to county. Table 15-1 contains a listing of principal federal and state recreational facilities in the action area, including the managing agency and the county in which the facility is located. In addition to these federal and state recreational facilities, various additional recreational facilities in the action area fall under the jurisdiction of local agencies. The Department of Defense is the single largest landholder/land manager in the action area. Areas under their auspices generally are not open to public recreational purposes, although federal and state agencies may retain jurisdiction over certain recreational facilities. Thus, the list provided in Table 15-1 is not exhaustive; instead, it includes those agencies that oversee the vast majority (by acreage) of the action area's institutionally recognized recreational facilities.

In some areas, PG&E's electricity and/or natural gas infrastructure may be located within or adjacent to local recreation facilities. The types and uses of these facilities vary greatly. In urban areas, typical recreation facilities may include parks consisting of playgrounds, picnic areas, sports fields, and bike and pedestrian pathways. In less developed areas, typical recreational facilities may include open space areas and trails for hiking, equestrian use, and off-road vehicles.

Table 15-1. Recreational Facilities in the Action Area¹

County	Owner/Manager	Property
Fresno	California Department of Fish and Game	Alkali Sink ER
		Avocado Lake
		Big Table Mountain
		Coalinga Mineral Springs PA
		Curry Mountain PA
		Fairfax FA
		Huron FA
		Kerman ER
		Little Panoche Reservoir WA
		Lost Lake FA
		Mendota WA
		Panoche Hills ER
		Pilobos
		Pleasant Valley ER
		San Joaquin FH
		San Joaquin River ER
		Three Rocks FA
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Millerton Lake SRA
	California State University	CSU Fresno
Kern	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Bitter Creek NWR
		Kern NWR
	California Department of Fish and Game	Allensworth ER
		Bakersfield
		Buttonwillow ER
		California Aqueduct—Region 4
		Lokern ER
		Northern Semitropic Ridge
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Tule Elk SR
Madera	U.S. Department of Defense	Eastman Lake Recreation Area
		Hensley Lake Recreation Area
	California Department of Fish and Game	San Joaquin River ER
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Wassama Round House SHP

County	Owner/Manager	Property
Mariposa	U.S. Department of Defense	Eastman Lake Recreation Area
	California Department of Fish and Game	Limestone Salamander ER
Merced	Federal Bureau of Land Management	Panoche Hills
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Grasslands WMA
		Merced NWR
		San Luis NWR
	California Department of Fish and Game	Cottonwood Creek WA
		Dos Amigos
		Jasper Sears Mitigation Parcel
		Le Grand
		Los Banos WA
		Merced River Spawning Habitat
		North Grasslands WA
		O'Neill Forebay WA
		San Luis Reservoir WA
		Volta WA
		West Hilmar WA
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	George J. Hatfield SRA
		Great Valley Grasslands SP
		McConnell SRA
		Pacheco SP
	The Nature Conservancy	Cyril Smith Trust
		Simon Neuman
San Joaquin	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	San Joaquin River NWR
	California Department of Fish and Game	Acker Island
		Clifton Court Forebay
		Corral Hollow ER
		Dos Reis FA
		Mokelumne River
		Vernalis Riparian Habitat
		White Slough WA
		Woodbridge ER

County	Owner/Manager	Property
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Carnegie SVRA Caswell Memorial SP
	City of Lodi	City of Lodi Treatment Plant
	City of Sacramento	Sacramento County
	City of Stockton	Louis Park
	The Nature Conservancy	Cowell McCormack-Williamson (Bean Ranch) Staten Island
Stanislaus	California Department of Fish and Game	Basso Bridge Fox Grove FA Gomes Lake North Grasslands WA Orestimba FA Tuolumne River Restoration Center West Hilmar WA
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Caswell Memorial SP Henry W. Coe SP Turlock Lake SRA
	California State University	Stanislaus State University
	The Nature Conservancy	Simon Neuman
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	San Joaquin River NWR
Tulare	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Blue Ridge NWR Pixley NWR
	California Department of Fish and Game	Allensworth ER Blue Ridge ER Kaweah ER Springville ER Stone Corral ER Yaudanchi ER
	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Colonel Allensworth SHP

Source: State of California 2004.

¹ Note that this table lists facilities within the action area only. Additional facilities outside the boundary of the action area are located in some action area counties.

This page intentionally left blank.

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Strategies

Methodology for Impact Analysis

Analysis of impacts related to recreation addressed the potential for implementation of the proposed action and each alternative to result in adverse effects on existing recreational opportunities in the action area. Impacts were evaluated qualitatively, based on professional judgment in light of the activities, methods, and techniques entailed by PG&E's San Joaquin Valley O&M program, and the additional avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs) that would be enacted under the proposed HCP (see Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*). More detailed information regarding impacts related to land use and land use planning is presented in Chapter 3.

Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact was considered to be significant and to require mitigation if it would

- include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment,
- increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, or
- result in long-term disruption of any institutionally recognized recreational facility or activity.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Proposed Action

Impact REC1—Potential to result in, construct, or expand recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

The proposed action would not directly or indirectly entail construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Some mitigation lands might accommodate very limited passive recreational uses, but infrastructure needs would be minimal, consistent with the primary purpose of these lands for habitat compensation. **There would be no impact related to construction or expansion of recreational facilities.** Where available at all, recreational uses would be strictly limited, and would be managed adaptively to ensure that

mitigation lands successfully achieve their designated biological purpose; this could include further restriction or elimination of recreational use, if needed. Consequently, **impacts associated with recreational use of mitigation lands would be less than significant.**

Mitigation Measure—No mitigation is required.

Impact REC2—Potential to increase the use of recreational facilities, accelerating or causing physical deterioration. The proposed action focuses on enabling PG&E's existing O&M and minor construction programs to continue in compliance with the federal and state ESAs. It has no recreational goal or objective, and although there is potential for some habitat mitigation lands to support passive recreational uses in the future, any such use would be very strictly limited because of the need to manage mitigation lands toward achievement of biological objectives. For the same reason, the types of recreation potentially available on mitigation lands would differ from the uses typical for developed neighborhood and regional park facilities, which generally support community gatherings, youth sports, picnicking, and other facilities-dependent recreation. Thus, the proposed action would not alter patterns of recreational use in any portion of the action area, and would not increase the use or cause or accelerate the physical deterioration of any existing neighborhood or regional park facility. **There would be no impact.**

Mitigation Measure—No mitigation is required.

Impact REC3—Potential for reduced recreational opportunities due to O&M and short-term construction activities. Existing rights-of-way (ROWs) for gas and electric transmission or distribution infrastructure may be located within or adjacent to existing recreational facilities. Such facilities may include improved or unimproved open space as well as trails for pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian use. Therefore, maintenance of existing facilities could occur within or adjacent to recreational facilities, temporarily disrupting recreational use. Construction required for preserve enhancements on ROWs located in existing recreational facilities could also result in temporary disruption of recreational opportunities.

To identify preferred timeframes for O&M and enhancement construction activities and minimize disruption of recreational activities, PG&E will continue to implement its land use planning process as described in Chapter 2 (see under *PG&E's Existing Environmental Programs and Practices*). Windows for certain construction activities may be constrained by operational restrictions or by BMP restrictions, such as the need to avoid certain types of activities during the migratory bird nesting season. Emergency repairs must typically be completed as quickly as possible to ensure safety and continuity of service; they typically cannot be deferred. Thus, although PG&E makes an effort to minimize impacts on recreation, temporary closure or limitation of access to existing recreational facilities could occur at any time during the year. However, recreational uses are restored as quickly as possible following the completion of maintenance, repair, or construction activities, and no substantial

long-term disruption of recreation is expected due to these activities. **This impact is thus considered less than significant.**

Mitigation Measure—No mitigation is required.

Impact REC4—Potential for reduced recreational opportunities due to installation of new, improved, or expanded aboveground facilities or structures. Some O&M and possibly also minor construction activities enabled by the proposed action would take place where PG&E owns land or leases ROW within an existing recreational facility. O&M activities are not expected to affect existing recreational facilities to the extent that access would be significantly reduced or the facility would be permanently closed. Minor construction is unlikely to result in new facilities of sufficient area to permanently alter recreational use; however, minor changes could occur depending on the nature of the facility and surrounding recreational uses. To ensure that any effect on recreational uses is minimized, PG&E will continue its current land use planning process as described in Chapter 2 (see under *PG&E's Existing Environmental Programs and Practices*). This entails consulting with local agencies and city and county jurisdictions to avoid or minimize conflicts with existing and planned land uses, including but not limited to recreation. In light of the consultative planning process that PG&E will carry forward under the proposed action, **impacts related to reduction of recreational opportunities or access due to new construction are expected to be less than significant.**

Mitigation Measure—No mitigation is required.

Impact REC5—Potential for reduced recreational opportunities due to implementation of compensation options. Most of the compensation options identified in the proposed HCP would not affect recreational uses in recognized recreation areas—for instance, contributions to existing mitigation banks and donations to conservation organizations would support only existing or already planned uses and thus would not result in new adverse (or beneficial) changes in recreational use. However, there is some potential for the *Enhancement as Compensation* option to reduce existing recreational opportunities if the ROW segments selected for enhancement are located within recreation areas.

Enhancement actions may involve reducing or eliminating human presence to prevent the trampling of plants, displacement of breeding birds or wildlife, or introduction of invasive nonnative species. Thus, habitat enhancement could preclude access to or through new compensation lands within existing ROWs located in recreational areas. Exclusion from recreation areas could reduce recreational opportunities, depending on the size and location of the enhancement area, the size and nature of the recreation area, and the accessibility of the enhancement area before and after enhancement begins.

The evaluation process for identifying suitable and appropriate conservation lands would likely screen out some potential enhancement sites within recreational areas based on the biological goals and objectives of the proposed

HCP. For example, suitable habitat for most special-status species is unlikely to be present in heavily used recreational areas, where heavy foot traffic, mountain bike use, off-road vehicle traffic, on-road traffic, and/or elevated noise levels could directly or indirectly disturb wildlife and degrade habitat. It is more likely to be located in lightly used recreational areas or in recreational areas where use is limited to certain activities or portions of the area, so these types of areas are more likely to be targeted for enhancement use. Situations may occur, however, in which options to enhance specific habitat types are limited. In such cases, a portion of an ROW in a recreational facility could be selected as a compensation site, and in some locations, there may be some potential to reduce or eliminate recreational access or certain recreational uses as a result.

The HCP stresses—and provides measures to achieve—avoidance and minimization of impacts. Compensation is invoked only in cases where impacts cannot be satisfactorily avoided or reduced, and even where compensation is identified as necessary, several other compensation strategies are preferred over enhancement. Thus, the *Enhancement as Compensation* option would probably be implemented only in a limited number of cases where preferable options are not available. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 2, PG&E will continue its current land use planning process under the proposed action. In siting new facilities, the company consults with local agencies and city and county jurisdictions to avoid or minimize conflicts with existing and planned land uses. Under the proposed action this would apply not only to siting of new facilities but also to location of proposed compensation lands. As a result, **impacts related to reduction of recreational opportunities or access as a result of habitat compensation are expected to be less than significant.**

Mitigation Measure—No mitigation is required.

Impact REC6—Potential to provide new or enhanced recreational opportunities due to establishment of preserves or other compensation lands. Although it would be speculative to identify the location or extent of potential future preserve lands, some preserves established as compensation under the proposed action may permit limited and very strictly regulated passive recreational uses such as birdwatching or nature photography. If so, establishment of preserves could provide new or enhanced recreational opportunities in the action area. **This outcome would represent a beneficial impact.**

Mitigation Measure—Because this impact would be beneficial, no mitigation is required.

Alternative 1—HCP with Reduced Take

Alternative 1 would enable the same program of O&M and minor construction activities described for the proposed action, with minor differences specific to commitments for the protection of biological resources.

Compensation ratios for loss or disturbance of habitat would be the same as under the proposed action; the key difference between the proposed action and Alternative 1 is an additional level of stringency associated with the implementation of AMMs at a lower level of effect than under the proposed action, with the intent of reducing take. As discussed in Chapter 2 (*Proposed Action and Alternatives*), the AMMs implemented under Alternative 1 would be the same as those described above for the proposed HCP. However, under Alternative 1, AMMs for certain activities would be implemented at a lower level of disturbance (for more detailed information about AMMs under the proposed action and the alternatives, see Chapter 2). Although the level of take would be reduced because of the increased stringency in implementing the HCP's AMMs, compensation is expected to be similar under both alternatives because compensation acreages would be calculated based on acreage affected, not level of take. Consequently, under Alternative 1, impacts related to recreational resources would be similar to those described for the proposed action.

Alternative 2—HCP with Enhanced Compensation

Alternative 2 would enable the same program of O&M and minor construction activities described for the proposed action. Differences between Alternative 2 and the proposed action center on compensation ratios for habitat disturbed or lost (increased under Alternative 2 by comparison with the proposed action). As identified in Chapter 3 (*Land Use and Planning*), increased compensation ratios could result in the establishment of a greater number of preserves or preserves that encompass larger geographic areas as compared to those established under the proposed action.

Under Alternative 2, assuming the same level of habitat disturbance, overall compensation requirements could be greater than under the proposed action, possibly resulting in greater potential to disturb recreational facilities and opportunities. Criteria for identifying suitable compensation lands would remain the same under Alternative 2 (see Chapter 4 of the proposed HCP in Appendix B), and selection of appropriate compensation lands would be subject to USFWS and DFG approval. Nonetheless, as the demand for compensation lands increases, availability of lands that support the appropriate habitat types can be expected to decrease, both within and outside of PG&E ROWs.

Where appropriate and available compensation lands cannot be identified for purchase or easement, other compensation options are available (e.g., purchase of mitigation credits, donations, and enhancement). Implementation of compensation options other than acquisition by purchase or easement may offset some of the difference in compensation ratios. However, Alternative 2 would still have the potential to permanently reduce recreational opportunities in the action area. Further, the enhanced compensation requirements under Alternative 2 could result in greater overall compensation requirements and as a result, a greater number and/or larger acreage of preserves. Consequently,

impacts related to recreation would likely be slightly greater under Alternative 2 than those described for the proposed action.

Alternative 3—HCP with Reduced Number of Covered Species

Alternative 3 would enable the same program of O&M and minor construction activities described for the proposed action, and would enact the same additional environmental commitments for other resource areas identified in this EIS/EIR. The key difference between Alternative 3 and the proposed action relates to the number of species covered under Alternative 3 (reduced by comparison with the proposed action, as described in Chapter 2). Depending on their status at the time, other species might be subject to state, and possibly also federal, requirements for impact assessment and compensation, which would need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Reducing the number of HCP covered species could result in the establishment of a lesser number of preserves or preserves that encompass smaller geographic areas (as compared to those established under the proposed action) as a result of activities enabled under Alternative 3. At the same time, additional, case-by-case assessment of compensation needs might be required for any individual activities identified as having the potential to affect noncovered special-status species. It is difficult to determine the precise effect that this approach would have on recreation since the species potentially involved, their listing status, and detailed compensation needs cannot be identified at this time. However, because Alternative 3 could require the assessment of at least some compensation needs on a case-by-case basis, it could result in the identification of smaller parcels of land (including ROW areas) for enhancement use, compared to the proposed action. Also, while Alternative 3 could result in smaller contiguous areas where access may be limited or closed, more numerous occurrences of closures or access limitations could occur under Alternative 3. Depending on availability of appropriate habitat, multiple restricted access areas could potentially be scattered within the same recreational facility or distributed among several facilities throughout the action area.

As the demand for compensation lands increases, availability of lands that support the appropriate habitat types can be expected to decrease, including areas within PG&E ROWs. Where appropriate and available compensation lands cannot be identified for purchase or easement, other compensation options are available (e.g., purchase of mitigation credits, donations, and enhancement); reliance on compensation options other than acquisition by purchase or easement could offset some of the difference in compensation needs. However, criteria for identifying suitable compensation lands would remain the same, and selection of appropriate compensation lands would be subject to DFG and possibly also USFWS approval, depending on the species involved. Alternative 3 would thus have some potential to permanently reduce recreational opportunities in the action area. Impacts would be similar under

Alternative 3 to those described for the proposed action, but the case-by-case approach to compensation determination for impacts on noncovered species under Alternative 3 could result in a greater number of preserves, and could also result in greater restrictions on existing recreational opportunities.

In summary, impacts related to recreation could be slightly greater under Alternative 3 compared to those described for the proposed action, but might also be slightly less, depending on the need for, and the outcomes of, case-by-case assessment outside the HCP process. Depending on the need for, and the outcomes of, separate case-by-case assessment outside the HCP process, impacts could also be slightly less than those identified for the proposed action.

Alternative 4—No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, PG&E would continue its existing program of O&M activities unchanged. No HCP would be implemented, and no other new environmental commitments would be put in place. The following paragraphs describe the range of possible outcomes for recreation under the No Action Alternative.

Individual actions affecting suitable habitat for listed species would be assessed through case-by-case consultation with USFWS and DFG for level of effect and associated compensation needs. Because the compensation requirements for habitat disturbance would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, smaller parcels of land (including portions of ROW areas) would likely be identified for enhancement at any given time, but case-by-case consultation could also result in more numerous occurrences of closures or access limitations. This is similar to but more extreme than the case described above for Alternative 3, where most compensation would be expected to occur under the auspices of an HCP process.

The availability of desirable compensation lands is expected to decrease over time, as lands are used for compensation or other purposes. However, as described for the action alternatives, where appropriate and available compensation lands cannot be identified for purchase or easement, other compensation options would likely still be available (e.g., purchase of mitigation credits, donations, and enhancement).

Potential adverse effects on existing recreational opportunities could be reduced under the No Action Alternative compared to the proposed action since suitable compensation lands might become more difficult to acquire on a case-by-case basis and payment-type compensation options might be used to a greater degree. It is difficult to assess the precise effect that this approach would have on recreation because locations and other details about specific habitat enhancement sites are unknown at this time, as are the actual compensation acreages that would be required.

If payment-type compensation options were not emphasized, the case-by-case approach to compensation determination under the No Action Alternative could result in a greater number of preserves, and/or greater restrictions on existing recreational uses than the proposed action. Consequently, impacts related to recreation could also be greater under the No Action Alternative than those described for the proposed action.

References Cited in this Chapter

- California Department of Fish and Game. 2004. Web site. Available: <<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/html/dfgmiss.html>>. Accessed: November 3, 2004.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. *California State Parks*. Available: <http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=91>. Accessed: November 3, 2004.
- National Park Service. 2004. Web site. Available: <<http://www.nps.gov/>>. Accessed: November 3, 2004.
- State of California. 2004. *The California Spatial Library: The California Legacy Project*. Available: <http://gis.ca.gov/casil/legacy.ca.gov/Cadastre_Land_Related/pctl/>. Accessed: November 3, 2004.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2005. Web site. Available: <<http://www.blm.gov/nhp/index.htm>>. Accessed: July 2005.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. Web site. Available: <<http://www.fws.gov/>>. Accessed: November 4, 2004.
- U.S. Forest Service. 2004. Web site. Available: <<http://www.fs.fed.us/>>. Accessed: November 3, 2004.